

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/867,526 | HOSOE, SHIGERU | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Dionne A. Walls | 1731 | |

All Participants:

(1) Dionne A. Walls.

(2) Michael Kelly.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 5 August 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
None

Claims discussed:
Those of Record

Prior art documents discussed:
None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner asked if the independent claims could be amended to change the "can be" recitation, to "configured to be" language to impart more of a positive "structural", as opposed to a "functional", aspect to the apparatus claims. Also, it was confirmed that claim 22, would depend from claim 14, instead of claim 20 - which was cancelled by Amendment, Applicant's representative, Mr. Michael Kelly, agreed to allow the changes to be made via Examiner's Amendment - which is attached .